

REMARKS

1. Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph

The Examiner rejected claims 30, 38 and 48 under 35 USC §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Applicants believe that the Examiner's rejection is based upon reliance on inappropriate word definitions. However, in an effort to expedite prosecution, Applicants have replaced the language in question. Specifically, claims 30, 38 and 48 have been amended. Accordingly, Applicants submit that the claims as presented in the amendment conform to all applicable requirements under 35 USC §112 and respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn. Applicants note that such amendments are not intended to limit the claimed invention. Rather, such amendments are made solely in response to the Examiner's rejections.

2. Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The Examiner rejected claims 30-45 and 48 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marnell (US 5,393,057) in view of Giobbi (US 2002/0107072). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. However, in an effort to provide clarification, independent claims 30-31, 35-39, 43-45 and 48 have been amended. For the sake of brevity, the rejections of the independent claims are discussed in detail on the understanding that the dependent claims are also patentably distinct over the prior art, as they depend directly from their respective independent claims. Nevertheless, the dependent claims include additional features that, in combination with those of the independent claims, provide further, separate and independent bases for patentability.

The Examiner has stated that claims 30-45 and 48 are unpatentable as being obvious over Marnell in view of Giobbi. However, the Examiner acknowledges that Marnell discloses only a single video screen (i.e., video screen 28) and even provides supporting citation (Col. 4, lines 17-29). Nevertheless, the Examiner alleges that Giobbi teaches three or more displays terminals (Para. 0019, 0020; Fig. 1; element 12a-12n). However, *display terminals* in Giobbi are clearly described as *gaming machines*, not video screens. Thus, Giobbi teaches the use of multiple gaming machines in a gaming system, but does NOT teach the use of three video screen in a single gaming machine, as required in the claimed invention. Indeed, in paragraphs [0026] and

[0030] Giobbi states that each gaming machine (i.e., terminal) has a screen displaying the game. Specifically, the claimed invention requires a gaming machine having “a first video screen displaying the first game located on the gaming machine; a second video screen displaying pay tables associated with the first game located on the gaming machine; and a third video screen displaying artwork associated with the theme of the first game located on the gaming machine; wherein the second game is reconfigurable on the three video screens in response to a remotely activated reconfiguration command.”

Furthermore, each of the reconfigurable video display screens provide specialized functions (game play, pay tables for the game, and theme artwork associated with the game, respectively) that enable a gaming machine to be completely transformed, both in function and appearance, from one game theme to another game theme. Accordingly, not only does the claimed invention remove the time consuming process of changing EPROMS (or other memory storage devices), it also removes the time consuming process of changing glass with silk screen artwork (or other physical artwork) typically attached directly on a gaming machine cabinet itself, none of which are addressed by any of the cited references. Therefore, neither the Marnell reference nor the Giobbi reference, teaches or suggests, either alone or in combination, each and every element (e.g., three video screens) of the claimed invention, as amended. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claims 30-45 and 48 as unpatentable has been overcome.

CONCLUSION


Applicants have made an earnest and bona fide effort to clarify the issues before the Examiner and to place this case in condition for allowance. In view of the foregoing discussions, it is clear that the differences between the claimed invention and the cited references are such that the claimed invention is patentably distinct over the cited references. Therefore, reconsideration and allowance of all of Applicants' claims 30-45 and 48 is believed to be in order, and an early Notice of Allowance to this effect is respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge the fees indicated in the Fee Transmittal, any additional fee(s) or underpayment of fee(s) under 37 CFR 1.16 and 1.17, or to credit any overpayments, to Deposit Account No. 194293, Deposit Account Name STEPTOE & JOHNSON LLP.

Should the Examiner have any questions concerning the foregoing, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned attorney at (310) 734-3244. The undersigned attorney can normally be reached Monday through Friday from about 9:30 AM to 6:30 PM Pacific Time.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 30, 2007



Brooke W. Quist
Reg. No. 45,030
STEPTOE & JOHNSON LLP
2121 Avenue of the Stars
Suite 900
Los Angeles, CA 90067
Tel 310.734.3200
FAX 310.734.3300